

would have taken time to look at the committee statement, you would have noticed that there was one person who appeared in favor of the bill. There were four organizations and/or people opposed, plus seven who took a neutral position. Now the one person who appeared in favor of the bill was the Governor of the state. Now I wonder why there was only one person appearing before the committee to support the bill. Well, it seems as though over in Iowa they appoint their regents, and in March they had a small problem over in Iowa. Part of the debate in the press and in the appointment of three regents says they are highly political appointments, adding that the governor is appointing Iowans who can lend valuable support to his reelection campaign in 1986. Now I am not accusing Governor Kerrey of supporting this bill because he would make highly political appointments that would help him in his reeducation. But I will say that there might, at some time, be a governor who would use this method to help his being reelected because it can be done. When you appoint someone to as powerful a position as the board of regents you have to stop and think about all of the fingers, and all of the input, and all of the people this board of regents not only contact but who they affect--the entire University system, which is Omaha and Lincoln where the votes are. So it would be a practical political appointment to make, and it could be used that way, and I would say that maybe in the future it will be used that way. Now Senator Hoagland got up yesterday, and why he is supporting this when he didn't appear in front of the committee I haven't figured out, but he was saying that these candidates have a low visibility, and people don't know who are the candidates for the regents because there are so many people on the ballot. But then he turned around and did 180 degrees and he said how much money was spent in these elections for the regents. So I don't understand if somebody goes out and spends 25, 30 or 40,000 dollars, two candidates do each maybe, to get visibility, how on the other hand you can say there is low visibility. So that argument won't hold water, Senator Hoagland. If somebody is willing to spend that kind of money to serve on the board of regents, fine. They must have the interest and they must be trying to tell the public they want the job, the same thing as when you run for the Legislature. We spend money to tell the people we want the job. So you talk about low visibility, the Legislature has low visibility. There are some senators that aren't even contested. So that is not a good argument to use. In fact, I don't think that